



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/664,535	09/19/2003	Jeffrey S. Lockwood	7175-73441	4275
<div>23643 7590 10/26/2007 BARNES & THORNBURG LLP 11 SOUTH MERIDIAN INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204</div>				
			EXAMINER BOGART, MICHAEL G	
			ART UNIT 3761	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/26/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/664,535

Applicant(s)

LOCKWOOD ET AL.

Examiner

Michael G. Bogart

Art Unit

3761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 32-35, 38 and 40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 32-35, 38 and 40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/4/2007 & 8/2/2007.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Request for Continued Examination

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2 August 2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections § 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 32 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gross (US 5,549,584 A).

Gross teaches a method of providing treating an open wound having a wound surface located inwardly of healthy skin surrounding the open wound, the method comprising:


providing a relatively thin and flexible member (42, 44) having a wound contacting surface with holes (48) in the wound contacting surface, a port (28, 56) to be attached to a vacuum source (12) and a plurality of channels (interstices in absorbent fabric (52)) extending between the holes (48) and the port (28, 56), and spacers (44) coupled to the wound contacting


Art Unit: 3761

surface, positioning the member (42, 44) so that at least a portion of the member (42, 44) is inside the open wound having at least some of the spacers (44) resting against the wound surface to space the wound contacting surface of the member (42, 44) apart from the wound surface, and providing a cover (18) over the member to define a space above the wound surface in which a vacuum is formed when the port (28, 56) is connected to a vacuum source (12)(col. 4, lines 56-67; col. 6, lines 10-46; col. 7, lines 41-50)(see figures 1 & 4, infra).

Regarding the interpretation of the term “channel”, it is construed herein as meaning a conduit or pathway. See *Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, 10th Edition (1996). See also, *Roget's New Millennium™ Thesaurus, First Edition (v 1.3.1)(2007)*. The claims must be given the broadest reasonable interpretation. MPEP § 2111. Applicants have not provided a specific definition of the term channel that precludes this interpretation.

It is noted that the adhesive spacer layer (44) directly contacts the wound during use.





Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 33-35 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross as applied to claims 32 and 40, above, and further in view of Olson (US 5,735,833 A).

Art Unit: 3761

Regarding claim 33, Gross does not disclose expressly a transparent flexible member.

Olson teaches a suction and irrigation cover (18) that is transparent so as to facilitate observation of a wound (col. 2, lines 59-67).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to select the transparent construction of Olson to make the member of Gross in order to allow observation of a wound and or state of the absorbent material under the member (for example, to determine whether absorbent (52) of Gross should be changed).

Regarding claims 34, 35 and 38, Gross does not teach the step of irrigating a wound through that device.

Olson teaches irrigation ports (52, 64) that deliver irrigating fluids to a wound site (see figure 5, *infra*). Adding these ports on Gross' cover (18) adjacent to Gross' port (28) would result in fluid passing through holes before irrigating the wound.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the irrigating ports and steps for irrigating a wound with the device and vacuum methods of Gross in order to provide for comprehensive treatment of a wound.




FIG. 5

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 02 August 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The status of the Office action dated 02 April 2007 is final as necessitated by applicants' amendments that were addressed therein and the requisite new grounds of rejection.

Applicants assert that Gross fails to disclose any channels extending between holes in a wound contacting surface and the port. This argument is not persuasive because Gross teaches an absorbent fabric (52) located between holes (48) and port (28, 56). The absorbent fabric (52) has interstices through which fluid may pass from the holes (48) to the port (28, 56). These interstices may be reasonably construed as channels because they serve as conduits or pathways for fluids. See *Webster's* and *Roget's*, supra.

Applicants assert that Olson fails to teach a single port. This argument is not persuasive because the neck (34) of Olson can be reasonably construed as a single port. Furthermore,

Art Unit: 3761

applicants use the transition phrase “comprising”. The transitional term “comprising”, which is synonymous with “including,” “containing,” or “characterized by,” is inclusive or open-ended and does not exclude additional, unrecited elements or method steps. See, e.g., *Mars Inc. v. H.J. Heinz Co.*, 377 F.3d 1369, 1376, 71 USPQ2d 1837, 1843 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (“like the term comprising,’ the terms containing’ and mixture’ are open-ended.”). MPEP § 2111.03.

Applicants’ single port does not preclude additional ports.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Bogart whose telephone number is (571) 272-4933.

In the event the examiner is not available, the Examiner’s supervisor, Tatyana Zalukaeva may be reached at phone number (571) 272-1115. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300 for formal communications. For informal communications, the direct fax to the Examiner is (571) 273-4933.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-3700.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/664,535

Page 8

Art Unit: 3761

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'MB', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Michael Bogart
14 October 2007

TATYANA ZALUKAEVA
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'T. Zalukaeva', written in a cursive style.